

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 12, 2004 (Paper No. 25). Claims 10 and 13 to 23 are in the Application, of which Claims 10, 13 and 14, are the independent claims. Claims 10, 13 to 15, 18 and 21 are being amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for the reason that the phrase “each predetermined time” lacks antecedent basis and therefore is unclear. In response, Claims 15, 18 and 21 are amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15 and 18 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 13 to 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,137,594 (Decker) or over U.S. Patent 6,141,120 (Falk). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Generally, the present invention concerns a method executed by a server such that the server corrects image data received from a client computer using correction data that it receives from an image forming apparatus. More particularly, the server is connected to a plurality of client computers and an image forming unit via a network. Correction data is received by the server from an image forming unit, such as a printer, via the network. In addition, image data is received by the server from a client computer. The server corrects the image data received from the client based on the correction data received from the printer. The server then outputs the corrected data to the printer via the network.

By virtue of this arrangement, the process of correcting image data based on

correction data, in order to form an image, can be distributed. That is, the server performs the process of obtaining the correction data and using the obtained correction data to correct print data of a print job received from a client computer, thereby reducing the burden on the client computer or the image forming apparatus.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 10 defines an image processing method which is executed by a server computer capable of being connected, through a network, to an image forming unit, which has a calibration function to obtain correction data by forming and measuring a patch, and to plural client computers. The method comprises an obtaining step of obtaining the correction data by communicating with the image forming unit, through the network, wherein the correction data is automatically obtained from the image forming unit, which executes the calibration function in the image forming unit to obtain the correction data. The server receives a printing job from a client computer. In a correcting step, using the correction data obtained from the image forming unit, the server performs a correction process on image data included in the printing job received from the client computer. The service outputs the image data corrected in the correcting step to the image forming unit, in an outputting step.

The applied art, namely Decker and Falk, is not seen to teach or to suggest the above features of the claim at least as regards a server which: 1) communicates with an image forming unit and a client to obtain correction data from the image forming unit and a print job from the client, 2) performs a correction process to correct image data in the print job based on the obtained correction data, and 3) outputs the corrected image data to the image forming unit.

Decker is seen to describe a technique to calibrate a specific printer in order

to generate a look-up table (LUT), referred to in Decker as a color rendering dictionary used to convert from a three-dimensional device-independent color space, Lab, to a four-dimensional device dependent color space, CMYK. The LUT, which is generated once for a given printer, is generated from color rendering dictionary data created from measurements of patches printed by the printer and input to a computer, such as computer 18 of Figure 4. Then a color rendering dictionary, or LUT, is generated and loaded into printer controller 14 for use in converting between the color spaces . (See Decker, Abstract, Figure 4, col. 13, lines 16 to 33 and col. 14, lines 39 to 53, and col. 15, lines 23 to 41)

Decker is not seen to show a server which: 1) communicates with an image forming unit and a client to obtain correction data from the image forming unit and a print job from the client, 2) performs a correction process to correct image data in the print job based on the obtained correction data, and 3) outputs the corrected image data to the image forming unit.

Falk is also not seen to disclose the above-identified features. Falk is seen to merely describe using a personal computer and a scanner to calibrate a printer. More particularly, Falk is seen to describe using the scanner to measure the color effects specific to the printer, and the personal computer uses the measurements to generate a calibration profile used to calibrate input image data.

Falk, and in particular the cited portions thereof, is not seen to show a server which: 1) communicates with an image forming unit and a client to obtain correction data from the image forming unit and a print job from the client, 2) performs a correction process to correct image data in the print job based on the obtained correction data, and 3)

outputs the corrected image data to the image forming unit.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 10 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 13 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant  
Carole A. Quinn  
Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200